

Remarks

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 15, 16, 18 and 19 were rejected, claims 1-14 were allowed, and claims 17 and 20 were objected to. By this Amendment, claims 15 and 17 have been amended. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 15, 16, 18, and 19 were rejected under § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,907,802 issued to Schneider (hereinafter “Schneider ‘802”). Applicants have amended claim 15 to recite a hose clamp installation tool having “a housing” and “an arm extending from the housing, the arm including a tab and an engagement surface.” The “tab contacts a first clamp tab and the housing is moved to position the engagement surface in contact with a second clamp tab to release the clamp from an open position and allow the clamp to shift to a closed position.” Schneider ‘802 does not disclose a hose clamp installation tool as claimed. Instead, Schneider ‘802 discloses a tool 10 having an axial rod 42 and a moveable member 14 (see column 4, line 66 through column 5, line 1). The axial rod 42 is “anchored at its proximal end in housing 12” (see column 5, lines 6-7) and includes a hooked portion 43 “used to engage clamp 20” (see column 5, line 13). The moveable member 14 comprises a sleeve 40 that is “moveably mounted on axial rod 42” (see column 4, line 67 through column 5, line 1). To activate clamp 20, the hooked portion 43 is first “inserted into slot 28a” of the clamp 20 (see column 6, lines 1-2). Trigger mechanism 48 “is then activated to extend sleeve 40 and to urge sleeve 40 into engagement with tapered arm 29” of the clamp (see column 6, lines 5-6). In other words, sleeve 40 is activated by trigger mechanism 48 and is not positioned in contact with the clamp by moving the housing. Consequently, Applicants believe that this rejection is overcome. Since claims 16-20 depend on amended claim 15, these claims are believed to be allowable for the same reasons.

Conclusion

Applicants have made a genuine effort to respond to the Examiner's objections and rejections in advancing the prosecution of this case. Applicants believe all formal and substantive requirements for patentability have been met and that this case is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES PANYARD et al.

By 
Matthew M. Mietzel
Reg. No. 46,929
Attorney for Applicant

Date: September 12, 2006

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351